

## REMARKS

In reply to the Final Office Action mailed on November 3, 2005, in which claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-15, 17, 18, and 20 were pending, reconsideration of the rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### **Claims 7, 13 and 20 are Canceled**

The Office has rejected Claims 7, 13 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written disclosure requirement. Applicants have canceled Claims 7, 13 and 20. Hence, the rejection of Claims 7, 13 and 20 is moot.

### **Claims 1, 4, 8, 10 and 17 are Allowable**

The Office has rejected Claims 1-5 and 7, in paragraphs 4-10 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,342,664 to Sawada, et al. ("Sawada"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

None of the cited references, including Sawada, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 1. In contrast to Claim 1, Sawada teaches an audio reproducing card that can receive a stick-like memory device and send radio signals to a receiving unit that allows a user to play audio corresponding to the signals. *See* Sawada, col. 9, ll. 63-67; col. 10, ll. 63-67. The receiving unit that plays the audio controls the audio reproducing card that receives the stick-like memory. *See* Sawada, col. 11, ll. 14-19. Additionally, Sawada teaches that the audio reproducing card and receiving unit communicate wirelessly, rather than either being removable from the other. *See* Sawada, col. 10, ll. 63-67 to col. 11, ll. 1-5. Sawada does not disclose or suggest an expansion module that resides on a removable component at a location away from a digital audio player, where the removable component is a remote control that is operable to control the digital audio player, as recited in Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-3 and 7 have been canceled. Claim 4 depends from Claim 1, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. Thus, Sawada fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of Claim 4, at least by virtue of its dependency from Claim 1.

The Office has rejected Claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 11, 13, 18 and 20, in paragraphs 11-19 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,606,506 to Jones ("Jones"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

None of the cited references, including Jones, disclose or suggest the specific combinations of Claims 1 and 8. In contrast to Claims 1 and 8, Jones teaches a headset portion that can receive a digital music source, such as a flash memory module, at one of its speaker housings. *See* Jones, col. 3, ll. 8-25. Jones teaches a separate control/display unit linked to the headset portion. *See* Jones, col. 3, ll. 13-15. Jones does not teach that the control/display unit can receive a digital music source, such as that received by the headset portion. Moreover, Jones does not disclose or suggest an expansion module that resides on a removable component at a location away from a digital audio player, where the removable component is a remote control that is operable to control the digital audio player. Thus, Claims 1 and 8 are allowable.

Claims 5, 7, 11, 13, 18 and 20 have been canceled. Claim 4 depends from Claim 1, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. Thus, Jones fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of Claim 4, at least by virtue of its dependency from Claim 1.

The Office has rejected Claims 1, 4, 7-8, 13, 18 and 20, in paragraphs 20-27 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Application Pub. No. 20020084334 to Zhang ("Zhang"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

None of the cited references, including Zhang, disclose or suggest the specific combinations of Claims 1 and 8. In contrast to Claims 1 and 8, Zhang teaches a digital audio player that can be inserted into a cassette tape player. *See* Zhang, paragraph [0027]. Zhang does not teach an expansion module that includes additional memory that is accessible by the digital audio player when the digital audio player is playing audio signals. Further, Zhang does not disclose or suggest the expansion module residing on a removable component at a location away from the digital audio player, where the removable component is a remote control that is operable to control the digital audio player. Thus, Claims 1 and 8 are allowable.

Claims 7, 13, 18 and 20 have been canceled. Claim 4 depends from Claim 1, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. Thus, Zhang fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of Claim 4, at least by virtue of its dependency from Claim 1.

The Office has rejected Claims 18 and 20, in paragraphs 28-30 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Application Pub. No. 20020080091 to Acharya, et al. ("Acharya"). Claims 18 and 20 have been canceled. Hence, the rejection of Claims 18 and 20 is moot.

The Office has rejected Claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-15 and 17, in paragraphs 31-44 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Acharya. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

None of the cited references, including Acharya, disclose or suggest the specific combinations of Claims 1 and 8. In contrast to Claims 1 and 8, Acharya teaches that "a user may use a remote control device to control the display of images on a display device *without* directly interacting with [the] expansion module or handheld computing device." *See* Acharya, paragraph [0112]. Thus, Acharya teaches away from an expansion module residing on a removable component at a location away from the digital audio player, where the removable component is a remote control that is operable to control the digital audio player. Thus, Claims 1 and 8 are allowable.

Claims 2-3, 7-9, and 13-15 have been canceled. Claim 4 depends from Claim 1, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. Claims 10 and 17 depend from Claim 8, which Applicant has shown to be allowable. Thus, Acharya fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of Claim 4 and of Claims 10 and 17, at least by virtue of their dependency from Claims 1 and 8, respectively.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the application and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney or agent.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

01-10-2006  
Date

Chad M. Herring  
Chad M. Herring; Reg. No. 41,067  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.  
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(512) 327-5515 (phone)  
(512) 327-5452 (fax)